

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/337,278**  
Response dated February 6, 2004  
Reply to OA of **November 25, 2003**

cleaned is soaked in water having a resistivity value of 10MΩ or less before cleaning.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10 are pending in this application. Claims 11-19 are withdrawn from the consideration. The support for all claim amendments is on p.5, lines 22-23. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **November 25, 2003**.

There were six issues decided in the appeal, corresponding to the six rejections in paragraphs no. 3-8 of the final Office action of March 25, 2002. These are summarized as follows:

1. Claims 1 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al. in view of Kanno.
2. Claims 1 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al. and Kanno in view of Takehiko et al.
3. Claims 3 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al. and Kanno in view of Simmons et al.
4. Claims 3 and 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al., Kanno and Takehiko et al. in view of Simmons et al.
5. Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al., Kanno and Simmons et al. in view of Chung et al.
6. Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Miyashita et al., Kanno, Simmons

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/337,278**  
Response dated February 6, 2004  
Reply to OA of **November 25, 2003**

et al. and Takehiko et al. in view of Chung et al.

The invention as now claimed is limited to a method of cleaning an alumina titanium carbide electronic component. All of the references only refer to semiconductor wafer cleaning generally. None of the references make any disclosure of an alumina titanium carbide electronic component. Thus, it is logically impossible for the references alone or in combination to suggest a method of cleaning an alumina titanium carbide electronic component. The references are completely deficient in teaching the claimed limitations and therefore a *prima facie* rejection of obviousness cannot be made.

The rejections are overcome in light of the amendments to the claims.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/337,278**  
Response dated February 6, 2004  
Reply to OA of **November 25, 2003**

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

  
James E. Armstrong IV  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 42,266

JAM/xl  
Atty. Docket No. **990659**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE